

## REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 17, 18, 23-28, 30-32, 36, 37, 42-44, 49-51, 53, 58, and 59 - 71 are now pending. The last office action from the examiner erroneously listed claim 53 as cancelled. While the fellow dependent claims on each side of dependent claim 53 were cancelled, claim 53 was not cancelled. This correction should be noted in the patent office records.

The Examiner rejected claims 37 and 44 and their dependent claims 41-43 and 48-50, respectively, under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicants regard as the invention. The Examiner states that the language that the database has a web page associated with each of the employees is unclear. The Applicants have clarified each of claims 37 and 44 to describe a database of employees and a web page associated with each of the employees of the database of employees. It is respectfully submitted that each of claims 37, 41-44 and 48-50 is clear and definite and meets the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner rejected claims 17-18, 23-28, 32, 37, 42, 44, 49, 51, 58 and 59 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bukow in view of Mitsuoka et al. Enclosed herewith please find a Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 from the inventors Charles Bernasconi and Shannon Wainright. As can be seen from the Declarations of the inventors and the supporting Attachments, the present invention was reduced to practice at least as early as March 19, 1999. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of these claims based upon Bukow, which has a priority date of June 3, 1999, subsequent to the Applicants' reduction to practice.

The Examiner rejected claims 30, 31, 36, 41, 43, 48 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bukow in view of Mitsuoka et al. and further in view of Thompson et al. (6,334,133). Again, based upon the Applicants' reduction to practice prior to the priority date of Bukow, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of these claims based upon Bukow.

The 12 newly added claims all depend from allowable independent claims and are therefore also allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing, claims 17, 18, 23-28, 30-32, 36, 37, 41-44, 48-51, 53, 58, and 59 - 71 are in condition for allowance, and that action is respectfully requested.

If the examiner or the examiner's supervisor believes that an interview might be effective to achieve allowance of claims as soon as possible, a telephone interview is requested and can be scheduled at the soonest possible time for the examiner and supervisor.

In the event an additional fee is due for this Response, you are hereby authorized to charge such payment to Deposit Account No. 07-1897.

Respectfully submitted,

GRAYBEAL JACKSON HALEY LLP



Jeffrey T. Haley  
Registration No.: 34,834  
155 108th Ave. NE, Suite 350  
Bellevue, WA 98004-5973  
Telephone: (425) 455-5575  
Facsimile: (425) 455-1046